


REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 19-35, as amended, remain herein. Claims 1, 3-5, 24 and 25 have been amended and new claims 26-35 have been added. Support for the amendments and the new claims may be found throughout the specification (see, e.g., original claims).


This Amendment is believed to place this application fully in condition for allowance, and surely in better condition for any appeal. Thus, entry of this Amendment and allowance of all claims 1-17 and 19-35 are respectfully requested.

1. Claims 1-8, 10, 12, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Nishikubo et al. JP 11-322656. Claim 1 has been amended.

Applicants' claim 1 recites a photoresist base material consisting essentially of an extreme ultra-violet reactive organic compound represented by the following general formula (1),



wherein A is an organic group selected from the group consisting of:




Nishikubo does not disclose applicants' claimed group A. Claims 26 and 28 are patentable over Nishikubo because applicants' claimed groups B,C, or D do not include tert-butyloxycarbonyl.


Thus, Nishikubo does not disclose all elements of applicants' claims, and therefore is not a proper basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

2. Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Hanabata et al. PCT Publication WO 02/079131. Claim 24 has been amended.

Applicants' claim 24 recites a photoresist base material consisting essentially of an extreme ultra-violet reactive organic compound represented by the following general formula (1),



wherein A is an organic group selected from the group consisting of:




Hanabata does not disclose applicants' claimed group A. Claim 27 is patentable over Hanabata because applicants' claimed group R does not include 1-ethoxyethyl.

Thus, Hanabata does not disclose all elements of applicants' claims, and therefore is not a proper basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.


3. Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Sakamizu et al., "Structural Design of Resin Matrix and Acid-labile Dissolution Inhibitor of Chemical Amplification Positive

Electron-beam Resist for Gigabit Lithography,” Journal of Photopolymer Science and Technology, 11, 547-552 (1998).


Applicants’ claim 25 recites a photoresist base material consisting essentially of an extreme ultra-violet reactive organic compound represented by the following general formula (1),



wherein each of B, C and D is selected from the group consisting of tert-butyl, 1-tetrahydrofuranyl, 1-ethoxyethyl, 1-phenoxyethyl, an organic group represented by



and an organic group selected from the group consisting of



Sakamizu does not disclose applicants’ claimed groups B, C or D. Thus, Sakamizu does

not disclose all elements of applicants' claims, and therefore is not a proper basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

4. Claims 9, 11 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Nishikubo in view of Niinomi et al., Proceedings of SPIE, 2724, Advances in Resist Technology and Processing XIII, 174-185 (1996). Claims 9, 11 and 15 depend from claim 1.

As discussed above, Nishikubo does not disclose all elements of applicants' claim 1. Specifically, Nishikubo does not disclose applicants' claimed group A. Niinomi does not teach or suggest what is missing from Nishikubo.

Neither Nishikubo nor Niinomi teaches or suggests applicants' claimed invention. Furthermore, Nishikubo and Niinomi disclose nothing that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. There is no disclosure or teaching in Nishikubo, Niinomi, or otherwise in this record, that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.


5. Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Nishikubo in view of Niinomi and Zhong et al. U.S. Patent 7,013,965. Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 1.

As discussed above, Nishikubo does not disclose all elements of applicants' claim 1. Specifically, Nishikubo does not disclose applicants' claimed group A. Neither Niinomi nor Zhong teaches or suggests what is missing from Nishikubo.


Neither Nishikubo, Niinomi, nor Zhong teaches or suggests applicants' claimed invention. Furthermore, Nishikubo, Niinomi, and Zhong disclose nothing that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. There is no disclosure or teaching in Nishikubo, Niinomi, Zhong, or otherwise in this record, that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

6. Claims 1-8, 10, 12, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ito et al. U.S. Patent 6,093,517.

Applicants' claim 1 recites a photoresist base material consisting essentially of an extreme ultra-violet reactive organic compound represented by the following general formula (1),



wherein A is an organic group selected from the group consisting of:



Ito does not disclose applicants' claimed group A. Claims 26 and 28 are patentable over Ito because applicants' claimed groups B, C, or D do not include hydrogen or tert-butyloxycarbonyl. Claim 29 is patentable over Ito because the photoresist base material of claim 29 does not include a polymer.

Thus, Ito does not disclose all elements of applicants' claims. Furthermore, Ito discloses nothing that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. There is no disclosure or teaching in Ito or otherwise in this record, that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and



withdrawal of this rejection.

7. Claims 9, 11 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ito in view of Niinomi. Claims 9, 11 and 15 depend from claim 1.

As discussed above, Ito does not disclose all elements of applicants' claim 1. Specifically, Ito does not disclose applicants' claimed group A. Niinomi does not teach or suggest what is missing from Ito.

Neither Ito nor Niinomi teaches or suggests applicants' claimed invention. Furthermore, Ito and Niinomi disclose nothing that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. There is no disclosure or teaching in Ito, Niinomi, or otherwise in this record, that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

8. Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ito in view of Niinomi and Zhong. Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 1.

As discussed above, Ito does not disclose all elements of applicants' claim 1. Specifically, Ito does not disclose applicants' claimed group A. Neither Niinomi nor Zhong teaches or suggests what is missing from Ito.

Neither Ito, Niinomi, nor Zhong teaches or suggests applicants' claimed invention. Furthermore, Ito, Niinomi, and Zhong disclose nothing that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. There is no disclosure or teaching in Ito,

Serial No. 10/531,208  
Attorney Docket No.: 28955.1048

Niinomi, Zhong, or otherwise in this record, that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

For all the foregoing reasons, all claims 1-17 and 19-35 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection cited in the Office Action. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge or credit any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 19-4293. Should the Examiner deem that any further amendments would be desirable in placing this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicants' undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

Date: April 11, 2008

Houda MORAD  
Roger W. Parkhurst  
Reg. No. 25,177  
Houda Morad  
Reg. No. 56,742

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP  
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036-1795  
Tel: (202) 429-3000  
Fax: (202) 429-3902